

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

10 MILDRED C FREESTON, et al,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 BISHOP, WHITE & MARSHALL, P.S.,  
14 et al,

15 Defendants.  
16

CASE NO. C09-5560BHS

ORDER DENYING  
EMERGENCY MOTION FOR  
REMOVAL

17 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiffs', *pro se*, emergency motion for  
18 removal (Dkt. 6). The Court has considered the pleadings filed in support of and in  
19 opposition to the motion and the remainder of the file and hereby denies the motion for  
20 the reasons stated herein.

21 On September 17, 2009, Plaintiffs filed an emergency motion to remove case no.  
22 09-20-08170-6 from Pierce County Superior Court to the United States District Court for  
23 the Western District of Washington. The Pierce County Superior Court Commissioner  
24 entered a ruling that led to Plaintiffs being ordered out of their home, effective September  
25 21, 2009. Plaintiffs contend their case, now in Pierce County Superior Court, is subject to  
26 the disposition of Plaintiffs' case before this Court, case no. 09-5560BHS. It appears from  
27  
28

1 Plaintiffs' emergency motion that they are defendants in the matter before the Superior  
2 Court.

3 **A. Removal**

4 Plaintiffs move the Court to remove their pending action in Pierce County Superior  
5 Court, apparently an unlawful detainer action. The removal statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1441,  
6 provides that "any civil action brought in a State court of which the district courts of the  
7 United States have original jurisdiction, may be removed by the defendant or defendants,  
8 to the district court of the United States for any district . . . where such action is  
9 pending."

10 Here, Plaintiffs do not assert any grounds for a valid removal of their pending state  
11 action. Further, it is the Defendant in a state court action that must remove the matter to  
12 federal court pursuant to the relevant statutes. In other words, the federal court is without  
13 authority to remove state actions to federal court. *See e.g.*, 28 U.S.C. § 1441.

14 Therefore, because, Plaintiffs have failed to properly effect removal from the State  
15 Court, the Court denies Plaintiffs' motion to the extent it is properly brought as a motion  
16 to remove.

17 **B. Temporary Restraining Order**

18 Plaintiffs' emergency motion is more properly treated as a motion for temporary  
19 restraining order (TRO). To obtain preliminary injunctive relief, the moving party must  
20 show: (1) a likelihood of success on the merits; (2) a likelihood of irreparable harm to the  
21 moving party in the absence of preliminary relief; (3) a balance of equities tips in the  
22 favor of the moving party; and (4) that an injunction is in the public interest. *Winter v.*  
23 *Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, \_\_\_ U.S. \_\_\_, 129 S. Ct. 365, 374, 172 L. Ed.2d 249  
24 (2008). Because Plaintiffs have not shown these elements to be present, a TRO cannot  
25 issue even if the Court possessed the authority to restrain the Pierce County Superior  
26 Court.

1 Here, Plaintiffs essentially ask the Court to restrain the Pierce County Superior  
2 Court from proceeding with the Commissioner's order in Plaintiffs' apparent unlawful  
3 detainer action. But plaintiffs motion is not properly before the Court. Further, it appears  
4 Plaintiffs have not exhausted the state remedies available to them following action by the  
5 Commissioner.

6 Therefore, the Court must deny Plaintiffs' apparent emergency motion for TRO.

7 **ORDER**

8 Therefore, it is hereby **ORDERED** that Plaintiffs' emergency motion for removal  
9 (Dkt.6) is **DENIED**.

10 DATED this 22nd day of September, 2009.

11  
12  
13   
14 BENJAMIN H. SETTLE  
United States District Judge  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28